

EXHIBIT 27

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
3 MARSHALL DIVISION

4 NETLIST, INC., (CAUSE NO. 2:21-CV-463-JRG
5)
6 Plaintiff, ()
7 vs. ()
8)
9 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., ()
10 et al.,) MARSHALL, TEXAS
11 (MARCH 29, 2023
12 Defendants.) 9:00 A.M.
13

14 VOLUME 2
15

16 PRETRIAL CONFERENCE
17

18 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODNEY GILSTRAP
19 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE
20

21 SHAWN McROBERTS, RMR, CRR
22 100 E. HOUSTON STREET
23 MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670
24 (903) 923-8546
25 shawn_mcroberts@txed.uscourts.gov

1 he had any information about the paragraph, whether he had any
2 other opinions that were not in here about the paragraph. So
3 the fact that Mr. Sheasby says, Aha, Mr. McAlexander didn't do
4 the analysis so we should just strike the whole thing is just
5 not true.

6 THE COURT: Okay. What else, counsel?

7 MR. LIVEDALEN: That's all that I have, unless you
8 have any other questions, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: I think I've asked my questions as we've
10 gone along. Thank you for the argument.

11 MR. LIVEDALEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Sheasby, is there anything you feel
13 compelled to revisit?

14 MR. SHEASBY: One thing.

15 If I can have paragraph 366 and 367.

16 So in this paragraph --

17 THE COURT: Let me save you some time, Mr. Sheasby.
18 I'm going to strike 366 and 367.

19 MR. SHEASBY: Thank you, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: All right. With regard to Document 208
21 and the Plaintiff's motion to strike portions of the rebuttal
22 expert report of Joseph McAlexander and the multiple subparts
23 that have been set forth and argued in this motion, as I
24 noted, I am going to strike paragraphs 366 and 367. I don't
25 think it's accurate that Judge Payne considered the

1 Defendant's arguments and found the claim term to not be so
2 limiting that 'pre-regulated input voltage' need not be the
3 same as 'input voltage'. Well, he did consider the arguments
4 and he found the claim term not limiting as presented at claim
5 construction, and not limiting in the way that 'pre-regulated
6 input voltage' is not necessarily the same and need not be the
7 same as 'input voltage' referenced at claim 16. And I think
8 this expert report treads on that and should be properly
9 struck, and I'm striking those two paragraphs.

10 With regard to the portion of the motion that deals with
11 what's alleged to be new claim constructions, I'll take these
12 in turn.

13 Paragraphs 402, 406 through 408, that's denied. That's
14 the issue with regard to converter circuit. I think that's
15 short of new claim construction and is the expert talking
16 about plain and ordinary meaning. And it's clear we're going
17 to have a battle of the experts in various places throughout
18 this trial. This is one of them.

19 In paragraphs 529 through 2534 and 537 through 538, same
20 ruling.

21 In paragraphs 530, 533 and 540, that's on updating the
22 bits of registers, same ruling.

23 On paragraphs 492 through 495 and 504 dealing with the
24 interpretation of 'operable state', that's the same ruling.
25 That's denied.